

Frankfort Architectural Review Board

February 15, 2005

Members Present: Andy Casebier
 Dwayne Cook
 John Downs
 Joe Johnson
 Roger Stapleton (5)

Members Absent: None (0)

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

A motion was made by Dwayne Cook to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 24, 2005. The motion was seconded by Joe Johnson and carried unanimously.

The first item of old business was a request, in accordance with Article 4 and 17 of the City of Frankfort Zoning Code, from the First United Methodist Church for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the demolition of a storage building, two car garage and education building on the property located at 211 Washington Street, zoned Special Historic (SH).

Mr. Robert Hewitt, Senior Planner, was present and stated that Mr. Joe Meyer, a Church representative, was present and stated that his structural analysis be the only one considered in this request. Mr. Hewitt showed power point presentations of the interior images. Mr. Casebier asked if he though the property could be repaired. Mr. Hewitt stated yes and also that the historical analysis should be looked at due to the structures presence on some old Sanborn maps. He added that he felt the storage building was an addition and not original. Mr. Hewitt stated the education building contributes to significant massing in the area. Mr. Johnson asked if there were costs for renovation submitted. Mr. Hewitt stated he told Mr. Meyer it was a requirement of submittal.

Mr. Joe Meyer, Chairman of the Building Team, was present and stated they wanted his structural report utilized. He stated the church has voted to move forward with the new facility and has had some fund raising. He stated the church can't tear down anything without the OK to put something back up. He stated their renovation costs for the current structures was \$581,250. He stated they could spend a lot of money and still not have a building that meets their programmatic needs. He added that it would still be a mismatch of materials if they renovated. Mr. Meyer stated the church is getting ready to invest 4 millions dollars with this project and they want to do it right.

There was no one in the audience to speak in opposition to the request.

A motion was made by Mr. Casebier to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the garage building as it did not seem to have significant character. The motion was seconded by Joe Johnson and carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Casebier to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the storage building as it does not appear original or as old as the Sanborn Map might indicate. The motion was seconded by Joe Johnson and carried unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the education building. The motion was seconded by Mr. Downs and carried unanimously.

The next item of old business was a request, in accordance with Articles 4 and

17 of the City of Frankfort Zoning Code, Kenneth Isaacs requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow miscellaneous exterior renovations (installation of vinyl siding, window replacement and reconstruction of the south and west exterior elevations) to the principle structure located at 302 Shelby Street, zoned Special Capital (SC). The applicant is requesting verification relating to the replacement window style and a modification to the entrance on the Third Street elevation. Mr. Hewitt stated he had met with the applicant and he wanted to make a change to the entryway and submitted designs dealing with the Third Street side.

Mr. Hewitt stated staff has received samples of the materials to be used based on the Boards approval and has determined that the applicant has satisfied all requirements with one exception. The applicant has decided to restore several windows but wishes to install replacement windows along several elevations. Mr. Hewitt stated a sample of the proposed replacement window was provided to staff and a field inspection was performed. He added as discussed at the initial ARB meeting, the existing windows are true divided light. Mr. Hewitt stated the replacement windows are simulated divided light with "grids between the glass". He stated staff informed the applicant's contractor that the proposed windows were not compatible with the existing windows and the window style would not be administratively approved.

Mr. Isaacs was present and stated the window dividers would be surface mounted. He stated there are two doors now on Third Street. He stated they want one door leading into the stairway as they are going to restore the stairway in the center. He stated they feel this would be a more appropriate entry and they will match the other wood door. He stated the columns are an exact replica of what was there. There was no one present in the audience to speak in opposition.

A motion was made by Mr. Casebier to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness and approve the modifications. The motion was seconded by Joe Johnson and carried unanimously.

The first item of new business was a request, in accordance with Article 4 & 17 of the City of Frankfort Zoning Code, from the First United Methodist Church for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a 26,885 square foot building addition to the sanctuary located at 211 Washington Street, zoned Special Historic (SH).

Mr. Hewitt stated that pages 13 and 14 of the staff report summarized the request and that staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Joe Meyer was present and stated a model of the project was displayed tonight for the Board. Mr. Jolly, Meyer & Jolly, was present and stated the roof would be standing seam metal. He added they are moving the structure in 10 feet from the alley. There was no one present to speak in opposition to the request.

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson to approve the request and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the building addition and approve the setbacks as shown on c-1. The motion was seconded by Mr. Downs and carried unanimously.

The next item of business was a request from Mr. Wesley Smith for a Certificate of Appropriateness to modify an existing window opening to accommodate a new window on the principal structure located at 415 Steele Street. Mr. Hewitt stated the window is located in a bathroom in close proximity to a bathtub along the north elevation adjacent to the interior property line. He added the project proposes to reduce the size of the existing window opening from 30" x 60" to 30" x 30". He stated the subject window, currently a 6 over 1 measuring 30" x 60" in size, is proposed to be replaced with a single pane window. He stated the windows on the north and south elevations of the structure consist of 6 over 1, 4 over 1 and 6 pane windows measuring 30" x 30" in size; two each on the side elevations, all located on the first floor. Mr. Hewitt recommended approval with the following conditions:

1. The approval is in accordance with the staff recommended design and specifications contained in Articles 4 & 17 as indicated in this report; 2. The existing exterior wood trim around the 30" x 60" window shall be preserved, modified and installed around the proposed 30" x 30" window; 3. The fill material shall consist of wood shake shingles matching the existing materials and installed flush with the façade; 4. Any additional projects requiring a building permit shall require review and approval by the ARB unless a certificate of no exterior effect is issued. There was no one in the audience to speak in opposition to the request.

Mr. Smith was present and stated he wanted the head to remain the same and change the sill. He stated he had a problem with true divided light and that he wants single pane windows as eventually he wants to replace all the windows on the house. A motion as made by Mr. Casebier to approve the request with all 4 staff conditions being met. The motion was seconded by Joe Johnson and carried unanimously.

The final item of business was a request from Cooper Taylor Partnership requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a wood picket fence with a vinyl picket fence along the sides and rear lot lines at 225 Capital Avenue, zoned Special Capital (SC).

Mr. Hewitt was present and stated the property previously had a wood picket fence that ran along the eastern and southern property lines adjacent to East Third Street and Felmer Court. He added the fence came under disrepair and many of the pickets had become broken due to vandalism. Mr. Hewitt stated the owners went before the ARB and were approved for the creation of an off street parking lot accommodating six cars in order to utilize the structure as an office building and citing an existing wooden fence. Mr. Hewitt stated the vinyl fence did not satisfy the criteria of Section 17.10, section 9.A, Walls and Fences, (2) dealing with fencing materials. He stated staff recommended denial of the request. Mr. Hewitt entered his staff report into the record.

Mr. Mark Garrison, a neighbor, was present and stated the previous fence was building in 1990. Mr. Richard Taylor, one of the owners, was present and stated they purchased the property in May of 2000. He stated they renovated the property and they feel they have improved the property. He added the wooden fence was there when they purchased the property. He stated over time the fence was vandalized. He stated the vinyl fence was not cheap and cost about \$4,300. He stated they felt it was attractive and would withstand vandalism. He stated they had had no complaints from neighbors except the Garrisons. Mr. Stapleton pointed out that a real wooden fence could be replaced by individual pickets if vandalized but a vinyl fence would have to be replaced by whole sections if vandalized. Mr. Casebier added that if vinyl is subjected to light that after a few years it becomes brittle and can break.

Mr. Mark Garrison was present and spoke in opposition to the vinyl fence. He stated he watched the wood fence come apart in the last year and that the material was very cheap. He stated he felt the vinyl fence looked cheap and it is 50% higher than what was there before. He stated he looks out at it and it is a complete change. He stated he would rather see no fence than this plastic fence. Mr. Hewitt stated he felt the fence was required by the BZA and that 4 feet was the maximum height. Mr. Stapleton stated he was concerned about the maintenance and it could become stained and brittle and it you have to replace a whole section then there would be discoloration.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to deny the request. The motion was seconded by Joe Johnson. Those voting in favor of the motion were: Mr. Cook, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Casebier, Mr. Stapleton. Voting against the motion was Mr. Downs. The motion carried by a vote of 4-1.

Mr. Hewitt informed the Board that the Dragon window grid has been installed and it appears they have complied.

A motion was made by Mr. Cook to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Downs and carried unanimously.

_____ Chairman

_____ Recording Secretary